

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark (U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0186312) (hereinafter “Stark”) in view of Trevino (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,349) (hereinafter “Trevino”) and further in view of the Japanese Publication to Ogata (Japanese Publication Number: H03-027684) (hereinafter “Ogata”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have newly-amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Accordingly, claims 1-5 remain currently pending and under consideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark in view of Trevino and further in view of Ogata. Applicants have newly-amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application in accordance with the configuration shown in Fig. 1 of the instant application. Namely, independent claim 1 of the instant application has been newly-amended to describe an advantageous combination of features of a solid-state image pickup apparatus including a

waveform shaping circuit $W_{1,m}$, a row selecting signal $S_{A,m}$ to be shaped and an associated gate signal, outputted from a row selecting section together with the row selecting signal $S_{A,m}$.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as can be seen from Fig. 1 of the instant application, the line length from the row selecting section 30 to the waveform shaping circuit $W_{1,m}$ necessarily becomes long on liberation from the row selecting section 30. This longer line length causes signal degradation (broadening of pulse width). In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention provides a gate signal, as a text for reconstruction of the row selecting signal, to the waveform shaping circuit $W_{1,m}$, by using the shortest line between the row selecting section 30 and the waveform shaping circuit $W_{1,m}$. In this regard, attached hereto is Exhibit A, which is Fig. 1 of the instant application marked-up by Applicants for reference by the Examiner in connection with these concurrently-filed remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that, in contrast thereto, the applied Trevino reference does not describe a circuit of generating an Access Signal 0-N. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that Trevino does not teach, or even suggest, any means for solving the problem caused by the signal line length. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that even if Stark and Trevino are combined, such a combination cannot achieve the claimed relationship between the lengths of the lines through which the row selecting signal to be shaped and the associated gate signal are respectively provided in the manner specifically described in newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Trevino, Stark, and Ogata, whether taken separately or combined, do not teach or suggest each feature of newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application. As pointed out by MPEP § 2143.03, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in

judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.’ In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” Since the prior art does not disclose or suggest any of the combinations recited in Applicants’ claims, and if anything appears to teach away from the current claim recitations, KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007), Applicants submit that such recited combinations would not have been obvious in view of the applied references of record, whether taken alone or combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims 2-5 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, and the reasons discussed previously.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response; the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including

any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: May 21, 2010

By:



Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465